

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending in this Application. A Non-Final Office Action dated November 10, 2004, rejected Claims 1-20. A response to this Office Action was not timely filed, and a Notice of Abandonment was mailed on June 15, 2005.

A Petition to Revive the instant application is being filed concurrently herewith this Response to the last Office Action along with a declaration that the entire period of delay in responding to the last Office Action was unintentional. In the response, an informality has been corrected and Claims 1, 2, 7, 13, 17, and 19 have been amended to further clarify the invention. No new matter is added by way of the amendment. Furthermore, for at least the reasons discussed in detail below, each of the presently pending claims is now in condition for allowance.

#### **Objection to Specification:**

The last Office Action objected to the Specification for two reasons. First, the specification allegedly listed an incorrect numbering convention for a serial interface. Second, the specification does not include a Brief Summary of the Invention.

In response, Applicants have corrected the numbering convention for the serial interface with an amendment. However, the Brief Summary of the Invention section has not been added in part because this is an optional section that is not required for allowance of this application. Since there is no requirement in the patent laws, rules or MPEP that an application must include a Summary of the Invention section, none has been included and this objection should be withdrawn.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Office Action has rejected Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action found that the term "unwritable" was not defined by the claim and the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite

degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

In response, the word “unwritable” was deleted and replaced with the phrase “read only” in amended Claim 17. Substantial support for this phrase can be found in the Specification at page 6, paragraph 13, lines 4-6. This amendment to Claim 17 does not add any new matter and only serves to clarify the invention as already claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Office Action has rejected Claims 1-12 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Blumenau et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,714, hereinafter “Blumenau”).

As amended, Claim 1 teaches that if a shared resource is detected as attached to a server, a query is performed to determine if the shared resource is associated with a share indicator stored at the server. Clearly, Blumenau does not anticipate this element of amended independent claim.

Instead, Blumenau discloses managing access at the shared resource itself, not at a server. (Column 5, lines 13-21). Furthermore, Blumenau teaches away from controlling access to a shared resource at centralized location such as a server. (Column 5, lines 33-38). Therefore, Blumenau neither teaches nor makes obvious this aspect of amended Claim 1.

Additionally, amended Claim 1 teaches that if a shared resource is unassociated with a share indicator, automatically creating a share file at a server that enables identification and automatically allocating sharing of the unassociated shared resource. Nowhere in the Blumenau reference is there a teaching or suggestion to automatically identify and allocate sharing for an unassociated share resource. Clearly, the cited reference does not anticipate or make obvious this further aspect of amended Claim 1. Therefore, Blumenau does not anticipate or make obvious amended Claim 1.

Furthermore, amended independent Claims 7, 13, and 19 are somewhat similar to amended Claim 1 in some ways, albeit different in other ways. Thus, these independent claims are also in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 1. Moreover, dependent

Claims 2-12 are also allowable for at least the same reasons as amended independent Claims 1 and 7, upon which they respectively depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action has rejected Claims 13-15 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau in view of Russell (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,991). Also, the Office Action has rejected Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau and Russell in further view of Fisher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,513,101, hereinafter "Fisher"). Additionally, the Office Action has rejected Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau in view of Fisher.


Clearly, there is no teaching or suggestion to combine the local shared device control of Blumenau with the centralized sharing taught by Russell and Fisher. In any case, the discussion above and the amendments to independent Claims 13 and 19, now make these obviousness rejections moot for dependent Claims 14-18 and 20. Thus, all of Claims 13-18 and 20 are now in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

By the foregoing explanations, Applicants believe that this response has addressed fully all of the concerns expressed in the Non-Final Office Action, and believes that it has placed each of the pending claims in condition for immediate allowance. Should any further aspects of the application remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Dated: April 5, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
John W. Branch  
Registration No.: 41,633  
DARBY & DARBY P.C.  
P.O. Box 5257  
New York, New York 10150-5257  
(212) 527-7719  
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)  
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant